DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 467 539 RC 023 664

AUTHOR	Howley, Caitlin; Ermolov, Lisa
TITLE	Evaluation of the RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services Program, 2001-02.
INSTITUTION	AEL, Inc., Charleston, WV.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2002-06-00
NOTE	58p.
CONTRACT	ED-01-CO-0016
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Youth; Intermediate Administrative Units; *Job Training; Labor Force Development; Low Income Counties; Out of School Youth; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; *Rural Youth; Secondary Education; Secondary School Students; Summer Programs; Tutoring; *Work Experience Programs; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*West Virginia; Workforce Investment Act 1998

ABSTRACT

Youth services programs funded by the federal Workforce Investment Act of 1998 provide educational services, mentoring, work experience, job training, and support services to help youth meet eductional or employment goals. This first-year evaluation of West Virginia's RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services Program interviewed 7 staff members and surveyed 83 in-school and out-of-school youths and 11 employers. RESA I covers 11 predominantly rural counties in southern West Virginia. Findings indicate that in- and out-of-school youth and employers were satisfied with the program. Youth respondents reported that RESA I staff were knowledgeable, helpful, and respectful, and employers indicated that they would recommend the program to other employers and planned to participate next year. On the other hand, youth would have preferred more tutoring in specific content areas, assistance with job searches, preparation for postsecondary life, more work experiences, and better compensation. Employers sought an easier process for program involvement and reported that some youth needed further training before participation. RESA I staff were pleased with the program's progress and their cooperative organizational culture. They were less pleased with slow Job Service response and the large caseloads. Recommendations for program improvement are offered to RESA staff. (Contains 21 references and survey questionnaires.) (TD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 467 539

Evaluation of the RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services Program, 2001-02

June 2002

Caitlin Howley

Lisa Ermolov

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

P.O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325 / http://www.ael.org

RC 023664

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluation of the RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services Program, 2001-02

June 2002

Caitlin Howley

Lisa Ermolov

P.O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325 / http://www.ael.org

AEL is a catalyst for schools and communities to build lifelong learning systems that harness resources, research, and practical wisdom. AEL serves as the Regional Educational Laboratory for Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. For these same four states, it operates the Eisenhower Regional Consortium for Mathematics and Science Education. The Region IV Comprehensive Center at AEL serves North and South Carolina in addition to these states. AEL also operates the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Information about AEL projects, programs, and services is available by writing or calling AEL.

Post Office Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325-1348
304-347-0400
800-624-9120
304-347-0487 (fax)
aelinfo@ael.org
http://www.ael.org

© 2001 by AEL, Inc.

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number ED-01-CO-0016. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. government.

AEL is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iv

INTRODUCTION 1

- Federal Workforce Investment Act Legislation 1
- West Virginia Workforce Development 1
- Region I Workforce Development 2
- Region I Counties 3
- Evaluation of RESA I Youth Development Services 6
- Performance Goals 7
- Purpose and Audience for This Report 9

METHODS 11

- Interim Staff Interviews 11
- Client Surveys 11
  - In-School Youth Survey 11
  - Out-of-School Youth Survey 13
- Employer Survey 13
- Database Review 14
- Document Review 14

FINDINGS 15

- Interim Staff Interview Findings 15
  - Youth Advisor Interviews 15
  - Youth Coordinator Interviews 19
- Customer Satisfaction Survey Findings 21
  - In-School Youth Satisfaction Survey Findings 21
  - Out-of-School Youth Satisfaction Survey Findings 26
- Employer Satisfaction Survey Findings 30

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 34

- Conclusions 34
  - Program Staff 34
  - In-School Youth 34
  - Out-of-School Youth 35
  - Employers 35
- Recommendations 36

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

REFERENCES 38

APPENDIXES 40

Appendix A: Satisfaction Surveys
Appendix B: Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

TABLES

1: 2000 Census Demographic Data for Region I Counties 4

2: 2000 Census Indicators of Economic Well-Being for Region I Counties 5

3: Proportional County Samples Sizes 12

4: Number and Percentage of In-School Youth Surveyed by County 22

5: Number and Percentage of In-School Respondents Using Type of Service 23

6: Federally Mandated Items for In-School Youth 23

7: Descriptive Statistics for In-School Youth Satisfaction Items 24

8: Number and Percentage of Out-of-School Youth Surveyed by County 26

9: Number and Percentage of Out-of-School Respondents Using Type of Service 27

10: Federally Mandated Items for Out-of-School Youth 28

11: Descriptive Statistics for Out-of-School Youth Satisfaction Items 29

12: Federally Mandated Employer Satisfaction Items' Descriptive Statistics 31

13: Employer Satisfaction Items' Descriptive Statistics 32

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998 superceded the earlier Job Training Partnership Act and authorizes a new workforce investment system. As a result of WIA legislation, states and localities formed Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) and workforce development regions. The workforce development services offered to in-school and out-of-school youth in West Virginia's Region I are the subject of this evaluation report.

West Virginia WIA Region I, encompasses Fayette, Greenbrier, McDowell, Mercer, Monroe, Nicholas, Pocahontas, Raleigh, Summers, Webster, and Wyoming counties. This region includes all school districts falling under the purview of West Virginia's Regional Education Service Agency I (RESA I) and several school districts in RESA IV, as well.

The Region I workforce investment board (R1WIB) approved the Region I plan in April 2001. According to federal mandate, youth services programs funded by WIA are to assist youth in meeting employment or educational goals they articulate in collaboration with staff. Programs for youth must include tutoring, study skills training, and instruction leading to secondary school completion; mentoring; paid and unpaid work experience; occupational skills training; leadership development; summer employment opportunities; and other support services. Participants are to receive counseling and follow-up services as appropriate, as well.

This end-of-year evaluation was primarily performed via the conduct of an interim staff interview to collect formative data, and via the administration of client (in- and out-of-school participants) and employer satisfaction surveys to collect summative information. Assessment of other federal performance objectives was not possible as their calculation is dependent on the number of clients exiting the program; this early in the program's implementation, no clients have yet exited.

Conclusions from this evaluation were that in- and out-of-school youth and employers were satisfied with the program. Youth respondents reported that RESA I staff were knowledgeable, helpful and respectful, and employers indicated that they would recommend the program to other employers and planned to continue their participation next year. On the other hand, youth would have preferred more tutoring in specific content areas, assistance with job searches, preparation for post-secondary life, more work experiences, and better compensation. Also, important to employability in remote rural areas, some participants requested assistance in obtaining a vehicle. Employers sought an easier process for program involvement and reported that some youth needed further training before participation in work experiences.

RESA I staff were pleased with the program's progress and their own collegial and cooperative organizational culture. They were less pleased with slow Job Service response and the large caseloads for which they were responsible.

Recommendations offered by the evaluator, and based upon the findings, include continuing to offer youth access to knowledgeable staff; ensuring that youth receive tutoring in specific subject areas as needed, assistance with job searches, and greater preparation for post-secondary experiences; and investigating students' concerns about work hours and compensation. In terms of employers, it was suggested by the evaluator that RESA I staff offer training to youth in areas employers report to be of concern, including social skills, work habits, and specific skill sets. RESA I should also consider establishing structures and processes that make employer participation simpler. In addition, the evaluator suggested that RESA I staff contact other WIA programs to investigate strategies for addressing slow Job Service turnover.

INTRODUCTION

Federal Workforce Investment Act Legislation

The federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998 superceded the earlier Job Training Partnership Act and authorizes a new workforce investment system (U.S. Department of Labor, 1998). This system includes state and local workforce investment boards and local youth councils who plan and monitor implementation of services to customers. Local boards, moreover, designate one-stop (locations at which all core services are available) operators and training providers (Boshara, Scanlon, & Page-Adams, 2000; Johnson, 2000). WIA is intended to consolidate myriad and often loosely-coupled, if at all coordinated, federal job training and workforce development programs. It is also intended to encourage localities to define their own needs and priorities (Beaulieu, 2000).

Via WIA support, one-stop centers provide a variety of employment, career training, and education services to youth and adults (Imel, 1999; Pantazis, 1999). Youth services are to assist youth in meeting employment or educational goals they articulate in collaboration with staff. Programs for youth must include tutoring, study skills training, and instruction leading to secondary school completion; mentoring; paid and unpaid work experience; occupational skills training; leadership development; summer employment opportunities; and other support services. Participants are to receive counseling and follow-up services as appropriate, as well.

Ultimately, WIA is intended to restructure the entire U.S. workforce development system (Buck, 2002). According to Buck's analysis of early implementation of the Act, WIA advances five major goals to achieve this end:

- Streamlining services through a One-Stop service delivery system involving mandated public sector partners;
- Providing universal access for all job seekers, workers and employers;
- Promoting customer choice through use of vouchers and consumer report cards on the performance of training providers;
- Strengthening accountability by implementing stricter and longer-term performance measures; and
- Promoting leadership by the business sector on state and local Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) (2002, p. 3).

The above goals, in turn, provide structure to state and local implementations of WIA.

West Virginia Workforce Development

On August 8, 2000, West Virginia's then-governor, Cecil Underwood, signed an executive order to comply with the federal WIA mandate (Governor's Workforce Investment Office, 2000). As a result, a state workforce investment board was created, as were local boards

and youth councils. Regions were also established within which one-stop centers (WORK4WV) were to serve local clients.

The Governor's Workforce Investment Office, in conjunction with the state Workforce Investment Board, provides oversight and guidance to regional programs. In addition, the state Workforce Investment Office is charged with assisting regions' efforts to streamline workforce development and other services. Ultimately, such coordination is intended to ensure that clients experience comprehensive, seamless service.

In late 2001, however, the state Workforce Investment Office was restructured by executive order of the governor ("Expert speaks on work programs," 2001; "Agency funding on hold," 2001; "Administration hears complaints," 2001). The state Workforce Investment Office was transferred from the Bureau of Employment Programs to the auspices of the state development office, and was thenceforth called the Governor's Workforce Investment Division.

According to the newly created Division web site, the purpose of the Division is "to coordinate workforce investment programs in West Virginia. [It] is also charged with providing technical assistance to Local Workforce Investment Boards in the state" (2002). Further, its mission is

- To create more and better jobs for West Virginians through training and subsequent placement of all unemployed and underemployed individuals.
- To identify West Virginia's current and future workforce needs.
- To coordinate business, education, and government efforts and resources.
- To promote economic development by providing employers with easy access to a highly skilled workforce (2002).

Region I Workforce Development

West Virginia WIA Region I encompasses Fayette, Greenbrier, McDowell, Mercer, Monroe, Nicholas, Pocahontas, Raleigh, Summers, Webster, and Wyoming counties. This region includes all school districts falling under the purview of West Virginia's Regional Education Service Agency I (RESA I) and several school districts in RESA IV, as well. The Region I workforce investment board (R1WIB) approved its plan in April 2001, after collaborating with Region I local elected officials in its development for several months and after public comment was solicited.

The R1WIB plan proposed to draw together a variety of services to local citizens, youth, and employers (West Virginia Workforce Investment Board, 2001). Services thus organized are to be coordinated and delivered seamlessly to clients. Among the services offered by the RESA I centers are those directed toward youth both in and out of school. The R1WIB and its youth council are responsible for coordinating local youth services and ensuring that all local programs providing assistance to youth are involved in some capacity at the one-stop centers.

Initial WORK4WV one-stop centers have been established in Beckley (13 agencies are situated in this location), Lewisburg, Princeton, and Summersville. Additional satellite centers are located in Fayetteville, Hinton, Marlinton, Union, Pineville, and Webster Springs.

Local education agencies for each of the 11 county school districts in Region 1 submitted proposals to the RESA I in the spring of 2001. Proposals described the manner in which districts intended to collaborate with the RESA I, including plans for coordinating youth services and leveraging resources in the counties to achieve the board's goals.

Region I Counties

The 11 counties constituting Region I are located in the southeastern portion of West Virginia and are primarily rural. According to the 2000 United States census (2002), the counties cover 8,372 square miles and are home to a total of 350,263 people.

Demographic data derived from the 2000 census for the Region I counties are presented below in Table 1. Pocahontas and Webster counties are the least populated, with respective populations of 9,131 and 9,719, whereas Raleigh and Mercer are the most populated, with 79,220 and 62,980 residents, respectively. McDowell County has experienced the largest population decline, losing nearly a quarter (22.4%) of its residents between 1990 and 2000. Monroe County, on the other hand, showed a 17.5% increase in population in the same time period. Fayette, Greenbrier, Nicholas, and Pocahontas counties showed the least change in population. All eleven counties are predominantly White, although McDowell has a sizeable population of African American residents (11.9%) that is well above the state average of 3.2%, as does Raleigh (8.5%). In terms of square mileage, Greenbrier County is the largest of the 11, while Summers County is the smallest. Mercer County is most densely populated, with 150 persons per square mile. Pocahontas is the least densely populated county, with only 9.7 individuals per square mile.

Indicators of economic well-being for the Region I counties are presented in Table 2. As with the demographic information, these data are drawn from the 2000 United States census (2002).

Monroe County appears to have the highest rate of home-ownership (84.5%), whereas Raleigh (76.5%) and Greenbrier (76.6%) have the lowest rates. McDowell and Webster counties have the lowest median household incomes of the eleven counties. McDowell residents earn a median income of $18,592 per year, and Webster residents earn a median annual income of $19,533. Raleigh County residents earn the highest median income of $27,864, which is somewhat higher than the state median income of $27,432. It should be noted that Raleigh County is the only Region I county approximating the state median income; the remaining 10 counties fall below the state median.

Table 1
2000 Census Demographic Data for Region I Counties[1]

County	2000 population	1990-2000 population percent change	Percent persons under 18	Percent White	Percent African American	Square miles	Persons per square mile
Fayette	45,579	-0.8	21.7	92.7	5.6	644	71.7
Greenbrier	34,453	-0.7	21.6	95.2	3.0	1,021	33.7
McDowell	27,329	-22.4	23.2	87.1	11.9	535	51.1
Mercer	62,980	-3.1	21.1	92.6	5.8	420	150.0
Monroe	14,583	17.5	20.1	92.7	6.0	473	30.8
Nicholas	26,562	-0.8	23.3	98.8	0.1	649	40.9
Pocahontas	9,131	1.4	20.9	98.4	0.8	940	9.7
Raleigh	79,220	3.1	21.5	89.6	8.5	607	130.5
Summers	12,999	-8.5	20.5	96.6	2.2	361	36.0
Webster	9,719	-9.4	23.0	99.2	0.0	556	17.5
Wyoming	25,708	-11.3	22.4	98.6	0.6	501	51.3
West Virginia	1,808,344	0.8	22.3	95.0	3.2	24,078	75.1

[1]Data extracted from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau website.

Table 2
2000 Census Indicators of Economic Well-Being for Region I Counties[2]

County	Home-ownership rate	Median household income	Percent below poverty	Percent children below poverty
Fayette	77.2	23,578	21.2	31.2
Greenbrier	76.6	26,800	16.2	24.3
McDowell	80.1	18,592	31.4	39.3
Mercer	76.8	26,279	19.0	29.3
Monroe	84.5	26,592	15.9	22.3
Nicholas	82.8	25,872	20.1	28.0
Pocahontas	80.3	24,035	17.5	26.4
Raleigh	76.5	27,864	17.4	25.7
Summers	79.1	21,664	24.2	34.1
Webster	79.0	19,533	28.5	38.9
Wyoming	83.3	23,994	23.0	30.3
West Virginia	75.2	27,432	16.8	24.7

The percent of persons living below the federal poverty line and the percent of children living below the poverty line are useful indicators of economic conditions. With nearly a third (31.4%) of residents living below the poverty line, McDowell County appears to be the least economically healthy county in Region I. Webster County, too, has a high percentage of residents in poverty (28.5%). Better off are Greenbrier, Raleigh, and Pocahontas counties, with respective percentages of persons below the poverty line of 16.2%, 17.4%, and 17.5%.

The percent of children living in poverty tends to be an even more dramatic indicator of economic health. In McDowell County, more than a third (39.3%) of youth live below the federal poverty line. More than a third (38.9%) of children in Webster County also live in poverty. Monroe County children seem to fare best of all, with 22.3% living below the federal poverty line. However, even this percentage, nearly a quarter, indicates that a significant portion of the population of children are living under strained financial circumstances.

Overall, it appears that Region I county residents are primarily White and tend to live in relatively sparsely populated rural areas. A significant portion of Region I residents struggle with

---

[2]Data extracted from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau website.

poverty, including a large percent of children. For the most part, Region I county residents' median annual income falls below that of the state median. Thus, the state context, and national trends as described by RESA I (2001a, 2001b), render Region I counties in need of the services outlined by WIA legislation.

Evaluation of RESA I Youth Development Services

AEL contracted with RESA I to conduct formative and summative evaluation of R1WIB's youth services program from July 2001 until June 2002. AEL is a private, nonprofit corporation headquartered in Charleston, West Virginia. AEL has served for over 35 years as the regional educational laboratory for Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, and also houses the Regional Eisenhower Math/Science Consortium and the Region IV Comprehensive Center. In addition, educators and others can receive services and information from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools at AEL. AEL also provides research, development, dissemination, and evaluation services on a contractual basis to national, regional, and local education agencies.

The Planning, Research, and Evaluation (PRE) unit of AEL has a strong record of successfully completed research and evaluation studies of educational processes, products, and projects. PRE staff are skilled in a wide variety of quantitative and qualitative methodologies, including focus group interviews, survey design and analysis, and participant observation. The unit also possesses technology to support data collection, analysis, and presentation, from qualitative data management software (e.g., NUD*IST) to statistical programs (e.g., SPSS). PRE staff adhere to *The Program Evaluation Standards* in the conduct of all their work. This evaluation of the RESA I youth services program was conducted by one Research and Evaluation Specialist and one Research Assistant. AEL also provided clerical and other support services toward the completion of the evaluation.

As per agreements between AEL and RESA I staff, the evaluation is to consist of both process and outcome measures. Process evaluation is to document the degree to which and ways in which the project is proceeding, and will provide staff with information for decision making. Hence, process evaluation is primarily formative. Data from staff interviews and document review will be collected for this purpose. Such formative and process evaluation will occur during the program's first year of implementation.

Outcome evaluation, primarily summative in nature, is to offer an assessment of the extent to which program objectives were achieved, particularly in regard to client and employer satisfaction. The achievement of performance goals will be calculated as stipulated by the U.S. Department of Labor and the West Virginia WIB. Data will be drawn from Individual Service Strategy (ISS) forms, RESA I's case management and data collection mechanism; from customer and employer satisfaction protocols; and from staff interviews. Outcome evaluation of the achievement of performance objectives other than client and employer satisfaction will begin in the program's second year of operation, as performance objectives are based on the number of

clients exiting the program and none have done so in the program's first year. However, evaluation of customer and employer satisfaction will be conducted in both the first and second years of the program.

Quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis are to be employed in order to produce a more accurate and comprehensive account of the project. Surveys, interviews, and enumeration of the achievement of performance objectives will be conducted, for instance.

In terms of reporting, AEL staff are to provide short, timely, user-friendly summaries, presentations, or oral communications of evaluation results to project staff as appropriate and requested. AEL contracted to produce an interim report in January 2002 of activities and accomplishments to date. This report was delivered to RESA I staff at the beginning of January, as stipulated.

AEL was also contracted to produce a final report summarizing formative and summative evaluation findings for use by program staff in June 2002. This report will serve the afore-mentioned purpose and will include data concerning the customer and employer satisfaction performance objectives for both the in-school and out-of-school youth programs.

Performance Goals

The Region I WIB stipulated required performance goals for the service area, which are presented below. To expedite the evaluation and to provide RESA I staff with more quantifiable, rigorous, and replicable data, evaluators operationalized the performance goals. Operational explanations of the performance goals, drawn in part from suggestions offered by Callahan Consultants (2001), follow below in italics.

Performance goals for in-school youth, ages 14-21, are as follows:

- Skill attainment rate: At least 73% of those in-school youth served by WIA have attained basic skills, work readiness skills, or occupational skills while receiving services. *The rate of skill attainment is the number of basic skill goals attained + the number of work readiness skills goals attained + the number of occupational skills goals attained divided by the number of basic skills goals set + the number of work readiness skills goals set + the number of occupational skills goals set by participants.*
- Diploma/GED attainment rate: Of those in-school youth who enter WIA services without a diploma or equivalent, at least 56% will receive one by the time they leave services. This does not apply to in-school youth who leave services and remain in school. *The diploma/GED attainment rate is the number of youth who attained a secondary school diploma or GED by the end of the first quarter after exit, divided by the number of youth who exit during the quarter (except those still in secondary school at exit).*
- Placement attainment rate: At least 55% of those in-school youth served by WIA are in one of the following activities six months after they leave services: post-secondary

education, advanced training, employment, military service, or a qualified apprenticeship program. *The placement attainment rate is the number of youth in post-secondary education + the number in advanced training + the number in employment + the number in military service + the number in qualified apprenticeships in the third quarter following exit, divided by the number of youth who exit during the quarter (except those still in secondary schools at the time of exit).*

- Participant customer satisfaction: At least 69% of the in-school youth served by WIA will rate their satisfaction with the programs as above average or excellent. *The participant customer satisfaction measure is the weighted average of participant ratings on each of the three federally required questions assessing overall satisfaction as reported on a 0- to 100- point scale. Additionally, to address the literal meaning of the RESA I satisfaction goal, customer satisfaction will also be measured as the percentage of respondents who give an average rating of 5.6 (where 5.5 represents a satisfaction assessment of "average") or higher on the 10-point scale across the three federally mandated satisfaction questions.*
- Literacy: Qualified instructors will provide WIA participants tested at two years or more behind grade level with educational enhancement. Of those students, 55% will raise their reading level by at least one grade level before exiting services. *The literacy measure is the number of students tested as two or more years below grade level whose reading levels are at least one grade level higher just prior to exit, divided by the number of students tested as two or more years below grade level.*

Performance goals for out-of-school youth, ages 19-21, are as follows:

- Entered employment: At least 59% of youth served by WIA who did not have jobs prior to services will have a job by the time services have ended. *The entered employment rate is the number of youth who have entered employment by the end of the first quarter after exit divided by the number of youth who exit during the quarter (excluding youth only in post-secondary education or advanced training).*
- Six-months employment retention: Of those students who are employed after exit and who are not enrolled in post-secondary education or advanced training, at least 78% still have a job six months later. *The six-months employment retention rate is defined as the number of youth who are employed in the third quarter after exit, divided by the number of youth who exit during the quarter (excludes post-secondary education and advanced training participants).*
- Six-months earnings gain: Those youth who are employed and who are not enrolled in post-secondary education or advanced training will earn at least $2,255 more six months after exiting services than they earned during the six months prior to entering services. *The six-months earnings gain is an average measured as average pre-program earnings (earnings in quarter two and quarter three prior to registration) subtracted from average post-program earnings (earnings in quarter two and quarter three after exit).*
- Credential attainment: Of those youth served by WIA funds who were in employment, post-secondary education, or advanced training when services ended, at least 51% will

receive a credential within six months of exiting the services. *The credential attainment rate is the number of youth who are in employment, post-secondary education, or advanced training in the first quarter after exit and who received a credential by the end of the third quarter after exit, divided by the number of youth who exit during the quarter.*

- Literacy: A qualified instructor will provide WIA youth tested to be reading below an eighth grade level. Of those youth, at least 55% will raise their reading level by at least one grade level before exiting the services. *The literacy measure is the number of students tested as two or more years below grade level whose reading levels are at least one grade level higher just prior to exit, divided by the number of students tested as two or more years below grade level.*
- Participant customer satisfaction: At least 69% of the youth served by WIA will rate their satisfaction with the programs as above average or excellent. *The participant customer satisfaction measure is the weighted average of participant ratings on each of the three federally required questions assessing overall satisfaction as reported on a 0- to 100-point scale. Additionally, to address the literal meaning of the RESA I satisfaction goal, customer satisfaction will also be measured as the percentage of respondents who give an average rating of 5.6 (where 5.5 represents a satisfaction assessment of "average") or higher on the 10-point scale across the three federally mandated satisfaction questions.*
- Employer customer satisfaction: At least 67% of the employers who hire Region I youth through the WORK4WV Center will rate their satisfaction with youth as above average or excellent. *Employer satisfaction is the weighted average of employer ratings on each of the three federally required satisfaction questions regarding overall satisfaction as reported on a 0- to100-point scale. Additionally, to address the literal meaning of the RESA I satisfaction goal, employer customer satisfaction will also be measured as the percentage of respondents who give an average rating of 5.6 (where 5.5 represents a satisfaction assessment of "average") or higher on the 10-point scale across the three federally mandated satisfaction questions.*

Customer satisfaction measures will be assessed in this first year of the program's operation. Both in-school youth satisfaction will be evaluated, as will out-of-school youth and employer satisfaction. The remaining performance objectives will not be evaluated at this time, however. Performance objectives are based upon client exits from the program; as no clients have yet exited at this early point in the program, calculation of achievement of the objectives is not possible.

Purpose and Audience for This Report

This report is intended to describe RESA I services to in-school and out-of-school youth provided thus far as mandated by the WIA. In addition, evaluation activities to date are recounted; the period for reporting ranges from June 2001 to May 2002. Primarily, however, this evaluation report summarizes summative data, with particular emphasis on the degree to which customers and employers reported they were satisfied with the program.

The primary audience for this report includes RESA I staff, particularly those responsible for leading, coordinating, and implementing youth services. The information in this report is intended to support their efforts toward continuous improvement and to provide them with a quantifiable, replicable, and rigorous account of their accomplishments thus far. Another important audience for this report is the R1WIB, who may find the data herein to be indicators of RESA I's performance in its first year of operating WIA-funded workforce investment youth services. Secondary audiences may also include other workforce investment boards, one-stop center staff, legislators, or additional organizations committed to providing workforce development services to youth.

METHODS

The methods employed for this evaluation of the RESA I Workforce Development Youth Services program are multiple and include interim staff interviews, client mail and phone surveys, an employer phone survey, and document review. Triangulation of data provides a more comprehensive description of the objects of study than might be rendered by use of a single data collection method. Using several data sources in order to corroborate theses is what Brewer and Hunter (1989) call "multi method research." This approach posits that the strengths of each method will compensate for the weaknesses in others, ultimately providing a more complete account of that being studied.

Interim Staff Interviews

To ascertain staff perceptions of effective strategies, structures or processes that support program implementation, interim outcomes, and issues and concerns, individual interviews were conducted with RESA I youth services staff (see Appendix A for interview protocols). Recommendations for improvements were also solicited from staff. The purpose of such interviews was to collect formative information with which project staff might make decisions about their program.

The interviews were conducted in person by the evaluator on November 20, 2001 at the Beckley WORK4WV center with six staff members. A seventh interview was conducted by telephone (and tape recorded) on the same day. The interview sample consisted of two youth coordinators and five of the six youth advisors. One youth advisor was unable to participate in the interviews due to prior commitments.

Interviews were tape recorded by the interviewer and transcribed by AEL support staff. Analysis was then conducted by question and theme, such that themes were identified within replies to each question and then tabulated. In other words, answers to each question were grouped thematically.

Client Surveys

Two surveys were developed by the evaluator to assess client satisfaction with various components and characteristics of the RESA I youth services program. Drafts of both surveys were provided to key youth services staff for feedback in March 2002; both were approved by RESA I staff in early April.

In-School Youth Survey. The survey measuring the satisfaction of in-school youth with the RESA I youth services program consists of 17 closed-response option items and 2 open-ended items. The first question asks respondents to place a check mark next to brief descriptions of program services they may have received. Items 2 through 4 are the three customer satisfaction questions mandated by the U.S. Department of Labor. The three items provide 10-point scales

with which respondents are asked to rate their responses. Items 5 through 17 are questions designed to ascertain more specific information about youth's experience with the program. Response options range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Finally, the last two questions seek more in-depth, qualitative information about youth's suggestions for program improvement and need for further assistance.

An informed consent form for parents or guardians of children under the age of 18 was developed for this administration of the in-school youth survey. The form, attached to the survey itself, asked parents or guardians of potential respondents to indicate their permission for the child's participation in the survey process. The form briefly explained the purpose of the survey and assured parents/guardians of their child's anonymity.

A proportional random sample was drawn from the population of RESA I in-school youth participants to receive the survey. In other words, county sample sizes are proportional to county participant population sizes vis-à-vis the overall RESA I in-school participation population.

The overall sample size was determined using the Creative Research Systems (CRS) online sample size calculator. To achieve a 95% confidence level, with a confidence interval of 5 points, a sample of 257 would need to be drawn from the overall population of 774. A confidence level "is expressed as a percentage and represents how often the true percentage of the population who would pick an answer lies within the confidence interval" (CRS, 2001). In other words, with a sample size of 257, RESA I staff can be reasonably certain that the sample findings represent the population.

The sample sizes per county are presented in the table below.

Table 3
Proportional County Samples Sizes

RESA I County	County In-school Participant Population	Percent of Overall RESA I Participant Population	Proportional Sample Size
Fayette	105	13.57 %	35
Greenbrier	74	9.56 %	24
McDowell	76	9.82 %	25
Mercer	130	16.80 %	43
Monroe	20	2.58 %	7
Nicholas	86	11.11 %	29
Pocahontas	16	2.07 %	5
Raleigh	86	11.11 %	29
Summers	30	3.88 %	10
Webster	63	8.14 %	21
Wyoming	88	11.37 %	29
TOTAL	774	100.00 %	257

Surveys were sent to the RESA I Youth Services office at the end of April. The surveys and consent forms were then distributed to the sampled students by each county's youth advisor in person beginning May 1. A reminder letter and additional copies of the survey and consent form were mailed to sampled students for whom RESA I had addresses who had not yet returned completed surveys (N=21) on May 21.

Out-of-School Youth Survey. The survey assessing the satisfaction of out-of-school youth was designed to be conducted via telephone. The instrument is identical to the in-school youth survey, with the exception that it consists of a more elaborate protocol for use by telephone interviewers. Thus, the survey contains 17 forced-choice items and 2 open-ended items parallel to those on the in-school youth survey.

Informed parental consent was not required of the out-of-school youth respondents. This is because out-of-school youth are over 18 years of age.

RESA I staff and the evaluator chose to administer the survey to the total population of out-of-school students given its relatively small size of 114. Eight of the 114 had no telephone contact information, reducing the number of out-of-school youth the evaluation team attempted to contact to 106.

A trained assistant began conducting the telephone surveys during the week of May 6, 2002. Due to the large number of sampled out-of-school youth who were not available during the daytime at the provided phone numbers, the evaluator and assistant conducted telephone surveys in the evenings beginning the week of May 21.

Employer Survey

A survey measuring employer satisfaction was developed by the evaluator in March 2002 and approved by pertinent RESA I staff in early April. This instrument, designed to be administered over the telephone, includes 15 forced-choice items and 2 open-ended prompts. The first item asks respondents to identify whether they provided unpaid or paid work experiences (or both) to program youth. The next three items are the three Department of Labor mandated satisfaction questions, with 10-point scales. Items 5 through 15 request employers to rate their level of agreement with various statements about their program experiences using a 4-point scale, in which 1 indicates strong disagreement and 4 indicates strong agreement. The final two items request suggestions for improving employer participation and a list of job skills employers think are needed by youth beginning program work experiences.

As with the out-of-school youth, informed consent was not deemed necessary. Employers were assumed to be adults over 18 participating in one instance of anonymous and confidential data collection.

As with the out-of-school youth participants, the evaluator chose to administer the survey to the population of employers who collaborated with RESA I during the contract year of June 2001-May 2002. The small population size in the program's first year of operation made such a decision feasible.

The survey was administered via telephone by a trained research assistant beginning the week of April 29 and ending the week of May 20, 2002.

Database Review

During the spring of 2002, RESA I youth services staff developed, in collaboration with a programmer, a database for the storage and analysis of ISS information. Ultimately, the database will replace the ISS, serve as a repository for all relevant case information, and provide reporting capabilities for staff and the evaluator.

However, at the time of this writing, the reporting functions of the database were not yet in place. Moreover, no program customers had yet exited the program, making the calculation of performance objectives impossible. Database review, thus, will take place at the close of the program's second year of implementation, June 2002-May 2003.

Document Review

Document review consisted almost entirely of the collection and analysis of media coverage of the Governor's Workforce Investment Office and the state Workforce Investment Board, and federal documents pertaining to WIA regulations. Census data for the 11 Region I counties were also accessed. These analyses provided the evaluator with information about the context within which the RESA I youth services program operated in its first year.

The evaluator also reviewed early drafts of the ISS and participated in a staff training session on, among other topics, the development of an effective, comprehensive, and useful ISS.

FINDINGS

In this section, formative findings from the interim staff interviews are reported. Customer and employer satisfaction measures are also discussed.

Interim Staff Interview Findings

The following account describes findings from the staff interviews conducted in November 2001, approximately six months into the program's implementation. These findings are also reported in the *Interim Evaluation of the RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services Program* (Howley, 2002).

Youth Advisor Interviews. Youth advisors reported a consistent account of the tasks they performed during a typical work day. These included traveling to school sites; meeting with students to develop their Individual Service Strategies (ISS) to set educational and career goals and to initiate service implementation; and offering "comprehensive guidance," as one interviewee put it.

Interviewees were asked what had most helped them conduct their work thus far. All five youth advisor respondents reported that other RESA I Youth Services staff, including their supervisors, had been the component of their experience proving most valuable in their efforts to implement the work mandated by the WIA. The team provided "tons and tons of support," is how one interviewee put it. Said one youth advisor, "I brag all the time; I tell everybody, you know, I am surrounded by the smartest group of [people] that I know . . . I have an excellent coordinator . . . [S]he gets things done that other people can't get done . . . [The other advisors] kind of watch out for me." Another interviewee noted the "camaraderie" among the youth advisor team. And yet another said, "The support of the other Youth advisors and the coordinators and the directors [has been the most helpful] . . . This is the most positive group of people I've ever worked with, and everybody's just helpful. If you don't know [something], you can call anybody at any given minute and they'll help you work through it."

One interviewee clarified that the most helped team mode of operation was regular and collaborative staff meetings: "Everything we do is in the team. So, you know, we have the monthly staff meetings, and we all get together to develop [things]. Everything is done together. So when we develop a new form and one of us has a new idea, [we say,] 'Hey, do you think this would work for you?' And then we all use it together." As a result of such open collaboration, this youth advisor reported, "I don't think I've had a negative day here since we've been here. It's amazing . . . Even if your idea is shot down, it's shot down in a good way, you know, so that you don't feel stupid."

Respondents were then asked to describe two or three additional things that might help them better conduct their work. In reply, all youth advisors with responsibility for more than one county school district (four of the five interviewees) said that they would prefer to work with

only one district apiece. Interviewees suggested that they would be able to provide more comprehensive, in-depth, and quality service to youth if they had smaller caseloads and less traveling to and from district sites. Lightened caseloads would necessitate hiring more youth advisors to accommodate all the clients, but staff maintained during interviewees that advisors would be better equipped to offer guidance and consistent follow-up under such circumstances.

One staff member phrased it this way: "If we only had one county, I would feel like I could give those students a little more time and stop back and see them in a day or two, where[as] now I just don't know where I'm going to be and I'm running all over." Another said that travel "takes up a lot of time when I could be with the kids doing stuff."

Interviewees only made a few additional suggestions in terms of strategies that would help them conduct their work more successfully. Two advisors reported that computer training would be beneficial to them, although neither specified the type of training in which they were interested.

Two interviewees suggested that the provision of a company vehicle might be useful. Both, however, indicated that this was not a priority issue; in fact, one acknowledged that such a request was probably an item on a "wish list." (This advisor went on to acknowledge that staff had been provided ample tools to conduct their work, noting that their supervisors "have treated us well. We have everything we need . . . We have laptops, we have [software] programs, we have cell phones, we have voice mail now . . . We have a great secretary.")

Two staff members noted that the process for providing services to youth and for data collection, the ISS, was being finalized. Becoming acclimated to the process and converting the ISS to a computer database would be helpful to their work, according to both advisors. Both also noted that this was not an area of concern because they understood that the ISS and the ISS database were works in progress. As one reported, "We're getting everything into the computer so it will be one system that flows [with] so much less paperwork . . . But that's being developed, so that's been taken care of."

According to one youth advisor, training in the interpretation of student assessment data would be helpful. This advisor also suggested that RESA I Youth Services staff convene a panel of business people to articulate their expectations for youth employees; making such standards explicit would help youth advisors prepare their clients more effectively, and would provide youth a means of learning what potential employers seek in applicants.

Youth advisors were asked to describe what strategies had been most effective in helping their clients, primarily out-of-school youth, meet career goals. However, because advisors were still in the process of completing ISS's with youth, interviewees had little to say in response to this question. "I only have, like, three out-of-school students that are still in the referral stage, so I don't get to focus on the actual getting them a job," reported one advisor, for example.

Nonetheless, interviewees did note a few strategies they found effective in helping students meet their career goals. Two advisors reported that helping students identify their career clusters and become more involved in the career exploration opportunities offered at their schools had been useful strategies. Both additionally indicated that many students were not even aware of the career cluster to which they belonged and which, in part, structured what courses they were assigned. For instance, one interviewee said, "I have seniors that don't know what their career cluster is, and this is what all their classes are based on."

Two other advisors reported that consistent, and sometimes aggressive, follow-up was effective. One interviewee recounted situations in which s/he had taken youth to work sites when they had otherwise planned not to attend, for instance. The other advisor added that follow-up included collaboration with the Human Resource Development Foundation (HRDF), an organization providing some services to out-of-school youth.

Staff were also asked what strategies had been less effective in helping youth achieve their career goals. One reported that "slow Job Service turnover" was a serious concern. "I completed applications with them [youth] in August, and this is November, and they're still not up and going," the advisor said. Although the youth coordinator supervising this advisor worked to facilitate faster turnover, the issue of attempting to collaborate with a bureaucratic organization remained and thereby continued to impede advisors' efforts.

According to another interviewee, the infrequency with which advisors were able to meet with each participant posed a challenge to efforts to assist students in achieving their career goals. As s/he reported, "They don't really understand when I sit down to go over the program with them. It's just all new. They're like, 'What? What are you talking about?' And, again, our numbers come into play. I'm going to see a student, possibly, four times a year. So how much work can I do with a student for fifteen minutes [four times a year] . . . an hour a year?"

One respondent thought that the ongoing changes to the ISS were less than helpful. Nonetheless, the advisor also understood that such changes were an unavoidable part of the ISS development process.

Next, youth advisors were asked to describe what strategies were proving most effective in helping clients meet their education goals. Four of the five youth advisors participating in the interviews reported that the counties' after-school and tutoring services seemed to be very successful. One advisor put it this way, "All of the actual staff that the county has hired to work with individual groups are great. They will bend over backwards for these kids . . . They have one at each school that provides the after-school program, and they offer tutoring, study skills, whatever. But the staff, they have just fallen for these kids." The county-level staff, in fact, had been so successful that "they actually have kids that want tutoring . . . The kids are saying, 'I want tutoring. Yeah, I want help. I want to raise this English grade or this science grade . . . That's amazing, because I know when I was in school, heavens no, I didn't want any more school."

Interviewees also mentioned the incentives for participation in the program that some counties had implemented. In one county, for example, "every six weeks, if they've got good attendance of some sort, they get $100. That's one strategy I like." Other counties provided opportunities for students to perform work and earn spending money, or to acquire leadership skills. Another county was planning to provide bus transportation for students participating in after-school Youth Services activities to facilitate their attendance.

Two youth advisors noted their own strategy for helping clients reach their education goals. Both reported that they assisted students in articulating what they hoped to achieve in terms of academics. They then asked students to explicate the steps needed to meet their goals. One advisor explained, "That's what I talk to them about. 'Your goal is to graduate high school. But what's the first step? You know, we've got to get you out of science class.' Then we work on it that way . . . I think that approach helps them. They see progress, and it helps the bigger picture become clear to them."

One interviewee thought that the paid summer work experience provided to youth had been a useful strategy to help clients meet their education goals. Although the advisor noted that this approach was being "phased out," s/he nonetheless reported that it had been a valuable opportunity for participants.

Asked what had been less helpful in assisting clients to meet their education goals, only two youth advisors responded with concerns. One interviewee reported difficulties with ensuring that the county-level coordinators offered all the services required: "They say, 'Don't make promises to these kids that you can't keep,' when we clearly have a list of [program] elements that we offer." For this advisor, the county was the impediment to full implementation.

The second respondent reported similar issues with the county-level program. "You'd have to have angels for a program like that to work," s/he said. This staff member explained that the program at the county level was not structured to encourage and support participation of struggling students. For example, incentives for participation in after-school activities were not offered. Even more troubling to the advisor was the lack of transportation from after-school activities to students' homes in this rural, impoverished county. According to the advisor, county staff should offer all the support they could afford in order to assist students; this not being the case, s/he suspected they were not as committed to improving the circumstances of students as might be desired.

Youth advisors were asked to make recommendations to improve services to youth. Three of the five respondents recommended that more advisors be hired so that each team member is ultimately responsible for fewer students and fewer counties. Said one interviewee, "If I were in one county, I could be building stronger relationships faster."

One interviewee recommended that counties be encouraged to provide transportation to students, both from after-school activities and to enrichment opportunities outside the county

borders. Another youth advisor suggested that professional marketing tools be developed to advertise the program. According to another respondent, more, and more effective, communication among staff would be helpful. And one interviewee recommended that staff simply continue to nurture relationships with school staff and students.

Youth Coordinator Interviews. Youth coordinators reported completing a variety of tasks in the conduct of their work. These included communicating with and providing oversight of youth advisors; providing information about the program to local civic, judicial, social, and education representatives; meeting with county coordinators to discuss budget and program issues; and facilitating collaboration between agencies.

Asked to describe any major accomplishments of the RESA I Youth Services program, both youth coordinators noted that the ISS process and template had been developed and that the majority of ISSs had been completed. As one put it, "The biggest thing that really started causing things to gel was developing an ISS form that we could live with that was practical, and then sitting down and actually doing the ISSs." Both coordinators estimated that approximately 80% of ISSs had been completed at the time of the interviews. This, in their view, was an especial accomplishment because, as one explained, "The counties were given their money and told to go through with this program. And they really had a month and a half jump on us before we came on board. So we played catch up for the first couple of months."

Interviewees mentioned other accomplishments as well. One mentioned that the facilitation of a summer youth program in each of the 11 counties had been successful, particularly as it was conducted in the midst of hiring new staff and developing the new WIA program. The other coordinator reported that RESA I staff had attended a summit in Philadelphia for WIA programs in the mid-Atlantic region. He explained, "We came away from there knowing that we're doing pretty much what we should be doing." The summit experience, then, validated the efforts of staff.

Youth coordinators were next asked what activities had yet to be completed. Both reported that approximately 20% of ISSs remained to be completed. One coordinator additionally noted that the program was required to locate and invite about 1,200 former JTPA summer youth program attendees to participate in the RESA I Youth Services program. Because many students had moved, transferred, graduated, or left school, the coordinators found this task very challenging.

Coordinators described several difficult issues they had confronted thus far. One interviewee reported that "catching up on the ISS was the hardest." As he explained, this challenge was compounded by the difficulties of advisor responsibility for several districts and by school schedules: "Well, you know, they have multiple counties . . . and it takes a while when you have to go out to the school system and work with the high school schedule or the junior high schedule. When you can pull this one student out of class, you don't want to–they're already behind, a lot of them. You don't want them to miss. So you may go out to a school and be able to

do one or two students in the morning, one or two at lunch, and hopefully you can pull a few out through the day through their free periods, or their advisory periods. We don't want to pull them out of math or English when they're already struggling. So that's a long time, to figure that you get three or four a day, and you have a hundred [total]. We hope to finish by next year."

This coordinator also noted that some of the school principals were resistant to the program given the many other programs competing for their attention: "The principals didn't really want to come on board because so many are coming to their schools anyway . . . [There are] a million programs out there, and we're just one trying to fight for a piece of time."

The other coordinator reported that the most difficult issue staff confronted concerned the large caseloads advisors had been given. The challenge of meeting the needs of a large caseload was compounded by the amount of time required to travel to and from counties.

Both coordinators were then asked to make recommendations to improve services to youth. One suggested that the eligibility process be streamlined. Asked to clarify this, he continued, "If a student is interested in the program, they will call Job Service or just show up at Job Service and in some counties . . . there's no Job Service there so you need to travel to Beckley or you need to travel to Welch. For kids, who don't have any money anyway and parents may not have any transportation, that's tough. And once you get to Job Service, you have to register . . . and there's probably 20 forms of documentation you have to have–proof of residence, birth certificate, proof of income, citizenship, selective service, just so many things for a kid who . . . doesn't find things easy or nothing comes easy for them and here they have to work to make two or three trips backwards and forth, bringing in documentation. Uh, in my experience in working with at risk youth, they'll make an effort once, maybe twice, you know. If they don't succeed, they're not going to try again . . . So unless you can catch them on that first trip through the doors, you're going to lose them. And forms need to be simple where someone on a 5th or 6th grade reading level can complete them, because most of their parents are on the same level, if that high." The other coordinator reiterated this point, saying, "A lot of the times, because of the nature of the clients, it's difficult to get them to fill out the paperwork.."

One coordinator also mentioned a difficulty with the satellite centers. He explained, "In some of the rural counties, the one-stop centers are satellite centers. In other words, there's no one on staff on a regular basis to do the testing. For example, in Pocahontas County, the person that does the testing has to drive from Lewisburg. And it's hard, and it's understandable, [he or she] just can't come up here and test one person. [He or she] has to wait until she gets five or six or a certain number, and then [he or she] comes up for testing. And that's difficult to get all of these youngsters together and again you have to understand, our client, clientele is the reason that they need to be in the program is because they have problems with schedules and transportation."

In addition, one of the coordinators suggested that services to clients would be improved if each county contact for RESA I Youth Services were not also responsible for a variety of other

programs. This interviewee added that such an arrangement might not be financially feasible, but he nonetheless thought it would be one strategy to strengthen the program.

The youth coordinators were asked to what they would recommend to make their own jobs easier. One coordinator replied that he was very satisfied with the support he received: "This is great." The other coordinator likewise reported that he did not require anything further to improve his work conditions. However, he again suggested that youth advisors have smaller caseloads.

Finally, the coordinators were asked to provide any additional information that might be important to the evaluation. One respondent praised the staff and the organizational culture: "They're just, they support us in every way that you could, but at the same time they give us our freedom to experiment." The coordinator went on to express appreciation for the way in which the program structure accommodated the particular rural needs of the area: "What's unique about this program, unlike most federal programs . . . where guidelines come down that do not apply to rural settings, [to the] uniqueness of the community . . . with us having a local board that sits in each area, they're able to . . . identify and understand the uniqueness of the community and the needs of our potential clients, the needs of the work force, the businesses."

The other coordinator reported a concern with the enrollment process. He noted that, upon enrollment, youth were to be enrolled in follow-up activities, although such activity could not take place until youth exit the program. The coordinator suggested that this issue be resolved.

Customer Satisfaction Survey Findings

Customer satisfaction findings from the three client surveys are discussed below. Response rates, descriptive statistics, and calculations mandated by the Department of Labor for all WIA-funded programs are presented as well.

In-School Youth Satisfaction Survey Findings. Of the participating in-school youth receiving RESA I services this year (N=774), 257 were selected for inclusion in the satisfaction survey using the Creative Research Systems (CRS) online sample size calculator (see p.11 for more details). Unfortunately, the response rate for this group of youth was very low. (This is not necessarily surprising, however, given the method by which surveys were distributed, the need for signed parental consent forms, and the youth of the participants.) A total of 60 youth returned completed questionnaires, representing a return rate of 23%. Such a low rate of response renders the generalizability of findings to the larger RESA I in-school youth population very tenuous.

Table 4 includes the number and percentage of respondents per RESA I County. Mercer County had the largest percentage of respondents, while there were no respondents from McDowell and Wyoming Counties. All county data are reported together; individual county responses were too low for disaggregation of survey data to yield meaningful results.

Table 4
Number and Percentage of In-School Youth Surveyed by County

County	N	Percentage
Fayette	11	18.3
Greenbrier	4	6.7
McDowell	0	0.0
Mercer	19	31.7
Monroe	2	3.3
Nicholas	10	16.7
Pocahontas	2	3.3
Raleigh	4	6.7
Summers	3	5.0
Webster	5	8.3
Wyoming	0	0.0

The survey requested that the respondents specify all of the RESA I services they received. Most reported that they received more than one service. The majority of respondents indicated that they participated in summer employment opportunities (68.3%) and paid or unpaid work experiences (63.3%). More than half of the respondents (53.3%) reported that they received job skills training. The least utilized services were alternative high school (5.0%), child care or transportation (10.0%), mentoring (15.0%) and follow-up services (15.0%). These data are presented in Table 5.

Internal consistency analyses were conducted to measure the extent to which satisfaction survey items measure a unitary construct. Overall, the instrument possessed sufficient internal consistency reliability for this administration, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .88. The three federally mandated items, analyzed as a subscale, were quite reliable, with an alpha of .92. Finally, with a Cronbach's alpha of .89, the remaining satisfaction items also possessed adequate internal consistency reliability for this administration.

Results from the three federally mandated items administered to in-school youth respondents are presented in Table 6. The mean ratings ranged from 7.71 to 7.59 on the Department of Labor mandated 10-point scale. In-school youth satisfaction was also measured as the percentage of respondents who gave an average rating of 5.6 or higher on the 10-point scale across the three federally mandated satisfaction questions. For the purposes of this rating, 5.5 represents a satisfaction assessment of "average." This process was done to assess the literal meaning of the RESA I satisfaction goal. RESA I exceeded the performance objective for in-

house youth satisfaction, with the percentage of respondents rating their satisfaction at above average ranging from 86.4% to 75.0% This is well above the 69.0% performance level set by RESA I in agreement with the state WIA board.

Table 5
Number and Percentage of In-School Respondents Using Type of Service

Service	N	Percentage
Alternative high school	3	5.0
Child care or transportation	6	10.0
Follow-up services	9	15.0
Mentoring	9	15.0
Leadership training	17	28.3
Guidance and counseling	17	28.3
Tutoring or study skill training	20	33.3
Job skills training	32	53.3
Paid or unpaid work experiences	38	63.3
Summer employment opportunities	41	68.3

Table 6
Federally Mandated Items for In-School Youth

Item	N	Mean	SD	% over 5.6
Overall satisfaction	59	7.71	2.21	83.10*
Expectations	59	7.64	2.29	74.60*
Ideal program	59	7.59	2.33	83.10*

*Meets federal WIA performance objective requirement.

The mean ratings for each of the three federally mandated items were converted to a 100-point scale in order to calculate in-school youth satisfaction conforming to the ACSI from which the items are taken. These values were then multiplied by the federally approved state formula weights and then added. The calculations, which resulted in an ACSI score of 73.95, are shown as follows:

Overall satisfaction: (7.71-1)/9 x 100 = 74.56
Expectations: (7.64-1)/9 x 100 = 73.78
Ideal program: (7.59-1)/9 x 100 = 73.22

(74.56 x .4092) + (73.78 x .3283) + (73.22 x .2625) = 30.51 + 24.22 + 19.22 = 73.95

The responses to the twelve questions asked to ascertain information about the respondents' experience with the program are summarized in Table 7. The mean ratings ranged from 3.66 to 2.87 on the 4-point scale developed by the evaluator and program staff. The standard deviations ranged from 0.58 to 0.85. The majority of respondents (94.6%) agreed that they were glad they had participated in the program (3.66, SD 0.58). The small standard deviation is evidence that there is little variation in the respondents' level of agreement with this item. Most of the respondents (92.9%) either agreed or strongly agreed that the staff were knowledgeable (3.50, SD 0.69) and that the staff respected them (3.46, SD 0.79). However, the somewhat higher standard deviations of 0.69 and 0.79 show that there was more variation in the respondents' agreement concerning these items. In addition, 89.3% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that the staff were helpful (3.52, SD 0.69) and 87.5% felt that the staff helped them find ways to participate (3.20, SD 0.75). It is also worth noting that the majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they did not have to wait a long time to receive the services they needed (85.7%), received a lot of information through the program (83.9%), and were involved in choosing the services that were right for them (81.8%).

Table 7
Descriptive Statistics for In-School Youth Satisfaction Items

Item	N	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Mean	SD
The services I received helped me meet my education goals.	56	76.8	23.2	2.96	0.76
The services I received helped me meet my career goals.	56	69.6	30.4	2.87	0.83
I was involved in choosing the services that are right for me.	55	81.8	18.2	3.11	0.79
The staff of this program were helpful.	56	89.3	10.7	3.52	0.69
The staff of this program were knowledgeable.	56	92.9	7.1	3.50	0.69
I felt that the staff respected me.	56	92.9	7.1	3.46	0.79
I did not have to wait a long time to receive the services I needed.	56	85.7	14.3	3.21	0.73
I received a lot of information through this program.	56	83.9	16.1	3.07	0.83
Staff helped me find ways to participate in the program even if there were circumstances that made doing so difficult for me.	56	87.5	12.5	3.20	0.75
I had experiences in this program that I would not have had otherwise.	56	78.6	21.4	3.16	0.85
I feel more prepared for my future because of this program.	56	80.4	19.6	3.21	0.80
I am glad I participated in this program.	56	94.6	5.4	3.66	0.58

The least highly rated item, with a mean of 2.87 (SD 0.83), was that the program helped the respondents meet their career goals. The extent to which the program helped the respondents meet their education goals was also less highly rated. However, with a mean of 2.96 (SD 0.76), many of the respondents did agree that their participation in the program helped them achieve their education goals. Further, 21.4% (3.16, SD 0.85) of respondents disagreed that they had experiences in this program that they would not have had otherwise.

In-school youth were also asked to complete two open-ended prompts in the final section of the survey. The first of these, *If I could change two things about the program, I would change . . .*, received replies from 48 respondents. Of these, 25 provided answers with multiple themes. Fifteen replies indicated that time was an issue: eleven respondents wanted more work hours, one fewer hours, two a longer summer program, and one more time for tutoring and community work. Thirteen responses suggested that participants be compensated with higher wages for their work, and one of these further suggested that participants be paid weekly rather than at the end of the summer. More activities, trips, and meetings were requested by nine in-school youth, and six others recommended that a greater variety of job types and opportunities be offered to participants, including job shadowing and specific job skills. Two responses requested more information from teachers; one of these suggested that teachers provide more information on college, specifically. Two respondents sought more assistance with transportation. Fifteen respondents reported that they would change nothing about the program.

The remaining themes were idiosyncratic and therefore could not be categorized. According to these themes, changes should be made to the program rules, the tools with which students perform their work, the food provided, the age at which participants are able to be employed, and the speed with which pay checks are received. One respondent requested that work sites be changed. Other suggestions included more assistance from teachers with job seeking, more polite staff, and enhanced general assistance from staff. One respondent also requested that students not have to work "in the rain."

The second open-ended prompt, *At this point in the program, I could use some help with . . .*, received 33 replies. The remaining respondents either did not complete the prompt or reported that they did not need help with anything. Nine respondents wrote that they wanted assistance with particular academic skills: three sought assistance with reading, two with math and science, one with geometry, one with math only, one with math and reading and test-taking, and one with social studies. Five respondents indicated that they would like help with finding work. Four requested further assistance with planning for post-secondary experiences, whether work, training, or college. Four respondents sought improvement of their social skills, including public speaking and controlling their frustration. Assistance with homework was requested by two youth. Two youth sought more work experience.

The remaining responses were unique and could not be categorized into themes. One respondent requested follow-up services, while another reported wanting assistance with "everything." Learning to become a better employee was important to one respondent, whereas

another simply requested the opportunity to do "more things." Preparation for an upcoming military examination was sought by one respondent, and another simply requested more involvement with the program. One student sought more information about nursing; another, more generally, requested assistance with choosing a career.

Out-of-School Youth Satisfaction Survey Findings. All participating out-of-school youth receiving RESA I services this year (N=114) were selected for inclusion in the satisfaction telephone survey. Of the 114, 39 were unavailable because they were no longer at the provided phone number and no new number was supplied; their phone service was disconnected; or the number on record was incorrect. These circumstances reduced the available sample to a total of 75. Ultimately, 31 out-of-school youth completed the telephone survey, for a response rate of 41%.

The number and percentage of respondents per RESA I county are presented in the following table. The largest percentage of respondents resided in Raleigh County, and there were no respondents hailing from Monroe County. County responses were too low, however, for disaggregation of survey data to render meaningful results; thus, all county data are reported together.

Table 8
Number and Percentage of Out-of-School Youth Surveyed by County

County	N	Percentage
Fayette	5	16.1
Greenbrier	1	3.2
McDowell	3	9.7
Mercer	2	6.5
Monroe	0	0.0
Nicholas	2	6.5
Pocahontas	4	12.9
Raleigh	8	25.8
Summers	3	9.7
Webster	2	6.5
Wyoming	1	3.2

Of the total 31 who agreed to take part in the telephone survey, eight reported that they had not participated in the RESA I program or did not know anything about it. These respondents

constitute slightly more than a quarter (26%) of the sample. Because they were therefore unable to respond to survey items, they are excluded from the analyses presented below.

Respondents were asked to indicate all of the RESA I services they had received. Many reported that they had received more than one service. The most oft-received service was the provision of job skills training; 87.0% of respondents indicated participating in such a service. Nearly two thirds (65.2%) of respondents each had participated in paid or unpaid work experiences or had taken advantage of summer employment opportunities. The service least accessed was child care or transportation (30.4%). These data are presented in Table 9.

Table 9
Number and Percentage of Out-of-School Respondents Using Type of Service

Service	N	Percentage
Child care or transportation	7	30.4
Leadership training	8	34.8
Follow-up services	10	43.5
Guidance and counseling	10	43.5
Alternative high school	10	43.5
Mentoring	11	47.8
Tutoring or study skill training	13	56.5
Paid or unpaid work experiences	15	65.2
Summer employment opportunities	15	65.2
Job skills training	20	87.0

To determine the extent to which satisfaction survey items measure a unitary construct, internal consistency reliability analyses were conducted. With a Cronbach's alpha of .88, the overall instrument possessed sufficient reliability for this administration. The three federally mandated items possessed much less satisfactory internal consistency reliability, with an alpha coefficient of .55. Finally, the remaining 10 quantitative items possessed very adequate reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of .93. Overall, then, this instrument is reliable for this administration, but interpretation of the three federally mandated items as a subscale assessing a unitary construct should be conducted with caution.

Results from the three federally mandated items are shown below. Mean ratings ranged from 8.48 to 6.63 on the 10-point scale. To address the literal meaning of the RESA I satisfaction goal, out-of-school customer satisfaction was also measured as the percentage of respondents who gave an average rating of 5.6 (where 5.5 represents a satisfaction assessment of "average")

or higher on the 10-point scale across the three federally mandated satisfaction questions. Using this measure, RESA I exceeded the performance objective for out-of-school youth satisfaction, with the percentage of respondents rating their satisfaction above average ranging from 73.7% to 92.5%. This is well above the 69.0% performance level.

Table 10
Federally Mandated Items for Out-of-School Youth

Item	N	Mean	SD	% over 5.6
Overall satisfaction	21	8.48	1.25	92.5*
Expectations	20	7.80	2.35	80.0*
Ideal program	19	6.63	3.18	73.7*

* Meets federal WIA performance objective requirement.

To calculate out-of-school youth satisfaction according to the ACSI, from which the three federally mandated satisfaction items are drawn, the mean ratings for each of the three items were converted to a 100-point scale. These values were then multiplied by the federally approved state formula weights, and then added. These calculations, resulting in an ACSI score of 75.24, are shown below:

Overall satisfaction: (8.48 - 1)/9 x 100 = 83.11
Expectations: (7.80 - 1)/9 x 100 = 75.56
Ideal program: (6.63 - 1)/9 x 100 = 62.56

(83.11 x .4092) + (75.56 x .3283) + (62.56 x .2625) = 34.01 + 24.81 + 16.42 = 75.24

Descriptive statistics for the remaining satisfaction items are displayed in the following table. Mean ratings ranged from 3.65 to 3.10 on the 4-point scale, and standard deviations ranged from 0.49 to 0.94. Respondents were unanimous in their agreement (100.0%) that program staff were knowledgeable (3.62, SD 0.50) and that they had received a lot of information through the program (3.64, SD 0.49). The small standard deviations indicate that respondents diverged very little in terms of the degree of agreement with these items. Most respondents (95.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that staff has been helpful, with a mean rating of 3.59 (SD 0.59).

Relatively least highly rated were the extent to which respondents thought that the program had provided them experiences they would not have otherwise had. However, with a mean of 3.10 (SD 0.83), most respondents (81.0%) agreed that they had, in fact, been provided such experiences through the program. With a mean rating of 3.15 (SD 0.75), respondents were also slightly less in agreement that the services they had received helped them meet their career goals: 20% disagreed that their career goals had been furthered via program participation.

Table 11
Descriptive Statistics for Out-of-School Youth Satisfaction Items

Item	N	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Mean	SD
The services I received helped me meet my education goals.	20	85.0	15.0	3.20	0.70
The services I received helped me meet my career goals.	20	80.0	20.0	3.15	0.75
I was involved in choosing the services that are right for me.	21	85.7	14.3	3.38	0.87
The staff of this program were helpful	22	95.5	4.5	3.59	0.59
The staff of this program were knowledgeable.	21	100.0	0.0	3.62	0.50
I felt that the staff respected me.	22	95.5	4.5	3.52	0.59
I did not have to wait a long tome to receive the services I needed.	21	90.5	9.5	3.24	0.77
I received a lot of information through this program.	20	100.0	0.0	3.65	0.49
Staff helped me find way to participate in the program even if there were circumstances that made doing so difficult for me.	20	95.0	5.0	3.40	0.75
I had experiences in this program that I would not have had otherwise.	21	81.0	19.0	3.10	0.83
Staff were available to answer my questions.	21	89.5	9.5	3.29	0.64
I feel more prepared for my future because of this program.	21	85.7	14.3	3.24	0.94
I am glad I participated in this program.	19	94.7	5.3	3.58	0.61

Out-of-school youth were asked to respond to two open-ended prompts. The first of these, *If I could change two things about the program, I would change . . .*, received replies from 16 respondents. Of these, seven provided answers containing two themes. Six respondents indicated that they would change nothing about the program because, as one put it, "the program is excellent." Three responses concerned the instructional opportunities provided through the program; one respondent, for instance, requested more hands-on training. Four replies related to time: Two respondents requested "more hours," another "less breaks," and a fourth that the program would "last longer." Enhanced participation and increased advertisement about the program was recommended by two other respondents.

The remaining replies were idiosyncratic and could not be categorized. One respondent wanted more pay, another more training and job opportunities, another more follow-up, and yet another less paperwork. Also proffered were suggestions that the program age limit be changed (although the respondent did not specify any further than this), that local programs be offered in closer proximity to students, and that some staff be more polite. Another respondent reported that the intake test had been a "surprise," and that she or he hadn't known to plan for it.

The second open-ended prompt, *At this point in the program, I could use some help with . . .* , received 17 replies, only one of which contained more than one theme. The remaining respondents did not complete the prompt. Of those who did reply, five reported that they did not require further assistance. As one such participant phrased it, "They helped me with everything." Four respondents wrote that they would like help finding a job. Two each requested assistance with obtaining a vehicle and improving their job skills. Planning for college was a theme cited by two participants, who wanted help both with planning for the undertaking and with information about financial aid.

The four remaining replies were unique and could not be categorized. One youth sought help with science and social studies, another with money management, and a third with "check[ing] if my records are up to date." The fourth respondent reported not knowing with what he or she needed help.

Employer Satisfaction Survey Findings

RESA I Workforce Development Youth Services staff supplied the names of 20 employers who had participated thus far in the program by providing paid or unpaid work experiences to youth. Telephone information was unobtainable for two of the employers, decreasing the available sample to 18. One contact person no longer was employed at the organization involved with the RESA I program, further decreasing the available sample to 17.

Evaluation staff could not reach five of the sample, and one respondent reported having no knowledge of the program. Ten employers participated in the telephone survey, and an eleventh refused to participate in the telephone administration but did complete the identical survey by mail. The eleven respondents constitute a response rate of 65%.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had provided unpaid and/or paid work experiences to program clients. Most (81.8%) had provided unpaid work experiences, but somewhat more than a third (36.4%) had offered paid employment.

To determine the extent to which satisfaction survey items measure a unitary construct, internal consistency reliability analyses were conducted. With a Cronbach's alpha of .87, the overall instrument possessed sufficient reliability for this administration. The three federally mandated items possessed less satisfactory internal consistency reliability, however, with an

alpha coefficient of .69. Finally, the remaining 10 quantitative items possessed very adequate reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of .91.

Descriptive statistics for the employer satisfaction survey's three federally mandated questions are presented in Table 12. As shown, mean ratings ranged from 9.13 to 6.11 on the 10-point scale, and standard deviations ranged from 1.25 to 3.59. To address the literal meaning of the RESA I satisfaction goal, employer customer satisfaction was also measured as the percentage of respondents who gave an average rating of 5.6 (where 5.5 represents a satisfaction assessment of "average") or higher on the 10-point scale across the three federally mandated satisfaction questions. Using this measure, RESA I exceeded the performance objective for employer satisfaction, with the percentage of employer respondents rating their satisfaction at above average ranging from 77.7% to 100%. This is well above the 67.0% performance level set.

Table 12
Federally Mandated Employer Satisfaction Items' Descriptive Statistics

Item	N	Mean	SD	% over 5.6
Overall satisfaction	8	9.13	1.25	100.0*
Expectations	9	6.89	3.59	77.7*
Ideal program	9	6.11	3.30	77.7*

* Meets federal WIA performance objective requirement.

To calculate employer satisfaction according to the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI), from which the three federally mandated satisfaction items are drawn, the mean ratings for each of the three items were converted to a 100-point scale. These values were then multiplied by the federally approved state formula weights, and then added. These calculations, resulting in an ACSI score of 73.32, are shown below:

Overall satisfaction: $(9.13 - 1)/9 \times 100 = 90.33$
Expectations: $(6.89 - 1)/9 \times 100 = 65.44$
Ideal program: $(6.11 - 1)/9 \times 100 = 56.7$

$(90.33 \times .4092) + (65.44 \times .3283) + (56.70 \times .2625) = 36.96 + 21.48 + 14.88 = 73.32$

Responding employers rated their level of agreement with statements about their satisfaction with various aspects of the program. As presented in the table below, mean ratings ranged from 3.80 to 2.82 on the 4-point scale. Employers agree most strongly that they would recommend the RESA I program to other employers (3.80, SD 0.42) and that they plan to continue participating in the program next year (3.55, SD 0.93). Respondents agreed unanimously (100.0%) that RESA I staff had been helpful.

On the other hand, employers were less satisfied that the process of providing work experiences to youth had been easy (2.82, SD 1.08), although the relatively large standard deviation suggests that there was some variability in respondents' ratings. Employers were also somewhat less in agreement that the youth with whom they worked possessed the necessary skills for working in their organization (3.09, SD 1.04)–more than a quarter (27.3%) of respondents disagreed that youth possessed such skills.

Table 13
Employer Satisfaction Items' Descriptive Statistics

Item	N	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Mean	SD
The RESA I Youth Services staff communicated the purpose of the program to me clearly.	9	90.0	10.0	3.30	0.66
The RESA I Youth Services staff were helpful.	9	100.0	0.0	3.44	0.53
The RESA I Youth Services staff understood my needs as an employer.	10	80.0	20.0	3.20	0.79
When I had questions or concerns about the program, RESA I staff responded quickly to them.	8	87.5	12.5	3.50	1.01
I received adequate support from RESA I throughout the process of offering work experiences to youth.	10	90.0	10.0	3.20	0.63
The process of providing work experiences to youth has been easy.	11	72.7	27.3	2.82	1.08
The youth I worked with had the skills I thought they needed for employment in my organization.	11	72.7	27.3	3.09	1.04
The youth I worked with were well-behaved.	11	81.8	18.2	3.45	1.04
I think experiences like the one(s) I provided will help youth in my area become better prepared for employment.	10	90.0	10.0	3.40	0.70
I would recommend this program to other employers.	10	100.0	0.0	3.80	0.42
I plan to continue participating in this program.	11	90.9	9.1	3.55	0.93

Respondents were asked to complete two open-ended phrases in the final section of the survey. The first open-ended question is as follows: *Youth need to come to work experiences like the one(s) I provided with the following job skills . . .* One employer gave six responses, four employers gave four responses each, four employers gave two responses each and two employers gave one response each. Embedded in the responses are several themes. Of these themes, seven related to the work ethic of participating youth, including promptness, ability to follow instructions, time management, and an overall good work ethic. Eleven of the themes related to

basic social skills, such as good manners, good behavior, respectfulness, and the ability to communicate well with others. Eight of the themes dealt with skill sets, including computer skills, organization skills, typing skills and basic skills such as good grammar, good math skills, and legible writing. Six of the themes represent qualities that cannot necessarily be taught in a classroom environment. They include self-confidence, common sense, a professional appearance, and a willingness to learn.

The second open-ended question prompted respondents: *It would be easier for me to participate in this program if . . .* One employer gave three responses to this question, one employer gave two responses to this question, and nine employers gave one response each. Again, the themes embedded in each of the responses are delineated. Three of the responses contained the general theme that no changes were needed to render the program easier for employers. Another theme expressed in three other responses was the desire to know more about the program. Four of the responses contained a theme dealing with time. In other words, these employers would have preferred more time to devote to the program and more advance notice of when the youth would begin their work experience. Further, two employers voiced a desire to choose the time period for youths' work experiences because of the seasonal nature of their businesses. Four themes related to the children themselves. One employer expressed a desire for contact with the children to be made easier. Another employer stated that the youth should be more well-behaved, should do the job that they are asked to do, and should be more closely supervised by RESA I staff.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A variety of conclusions may be made from the data collected over the course of the RESA I Youth Services program's first year of implementation. In addition, the conclusions connote recommendations staff might consider as they continue to develop and improve their services.

Conclusions

Conclusions are categorized by the stakeholder group to which they refer.

Program Staff. Interim staff interviews indicate that staff feel supported and nurtured by their supervisors and colleagues alike. The program culture among youth advisors, youth coordinators, and the program director is collaborative and collegial.

At the mid-point of the program's first year, staff had few concerns. Most significantly, youth advisors would prefer to serve only one county apiece, an arrangement they reported would decrease caseloads and minimize travel time. Ultimately, staff thought that their services to clients would become more targeted, more intensive, and of better quality if they were responsible for fewer youth. According to staff in informal communications with the evaluator following the distribution of the *Interim Evaluation of the RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services Program*, this concern was addressed by program administrators, who agreed to hire more youth advisors during the next contract year.

Another challenge youth services staff faced was slow Job Service turnaround, a complication which effectively thwarted efforts to coordinate services to clients. Informal telephone communications with staff during April 2002 indicate that this remains a concern for RESA I Youth Services staff.

In-School Youth. The survey response rate for this group of youth was very low, and no responses were received from two of the Region I counties. The generalizability of findings from this sample to the larger population of RESA I in-school youth participants is therefore compromised.

In-school youth took most advantage of paid or unpaid work experiences and summer employment opportunities through the RESA I program. Many also received job skills training. Far fewer, however, availed themselves of alternative high school or child care and transportation.

In-school respondents were satisfied overall with the RESA I program. Their expectations about the program tended to have been more than met, and the program approximated the ideal program for individuals in their circumstances. Respondents' levels of satisfaction exceeded the federal performance objective.

Respondents were overwhelmingly glad to have participated in the program. Many also agreed that the RESA I staff were helpful, knowledgeable, and respectful of participants. On the other hand, in-school respondents were somewhat less in agreement that the program had helped them meet their career and education goals.

In-school youth had need for both academic and work assistance. Tutoring in specific areas, preparation for their post-secondary lives, and assistance with job searches were requested often by respondents. Changes to the pay structure for work experiences were also sought by in-school youth. In addition, youth wanted increased work hours.

Out-of-School Youth. The response rate for out-of-school youth was low. This is not altogether surprising, given that rural and/or impoverished families may not have telephone service or may move often.

Out-of-school youth most often took advantage of job-skills training and paid or unpaid work experiences. Least accessed were child care or transportation assistance; nonetheless, nearly a third of participants reported receiving these services.

Out-of-school youth were quite satisfied with the RESA I program. Their ratings for all three federally mandated satisfaction items exceeded the federal WIA performance objective.

According to out-of-school respondents, program staff were knowledgeable and helpful. Respondents also received a lot of information through the program. On the other hand, respondents were somewhat less in agreement that they had experiences via the program that they would not have had otherwise.

Out-of-school youth reported that the program was worthwhile and helpful, but that its services could be extended, more and more hands on training could be offered, and greater numbers of clients could be attracted to it. Youth reported currently needed assistance with seeking a job, obtaining job skills and a vehicle, and finding more information on post-secondary opportunities.

Employers. Relatively few employers responded to the satisfaction survey, and the initial sample was somewhat limited as well. This, however, is likely because the program is in its early stages of development. One would expect higher levels of employer participation in the coming years.

Employer satisfaction with the RESA I program exceeded the performance objective for this year of implementation. In general, employers were pleased with the program overall, thought that it had at least met their expectations, and that it began to approximate the ideal program for people in their circumstances.

Employers would recommend the program to other employers and plan to continue their participation in the coming year. On the other hand, some responding employers did not think that the process of providing work experiences to youth had been particularly easy. In addition, some respondents thought that the youth with whom they worked did not possess the needed skills for working in their organization.

Recommendations

- RESA I staff should continue to nurture their organizational culture of cooperation and collegiality.
- Staff might want to contact other WIA programs to investigate strategies for addressing slow Job Service turnaround. Professional development experiences might be offered to staff around resolving this issue.
- RESA I should continue to offer participants access to knowledgeable, helpful, and respectful staff.
- Program staff should work to ensure that participants' career and education goals are clearly articulated and that program services are deployed for their achievement.
- Tutoring in specific content areas, assistance with job searches, and preparation for post-secondary experiences are services RESA I staff ought to target more fully to in-school youth.
- RESA I staff might want to consider allowing some students to increase their work hours.
- RESA I staff and local program staff should consider collaborating to offer enhanced job search and academic assistance to out-of-school youth. This might include more content-focused tutoring, on academic subjects or on job-seeking skills, as students evidence a need for it.
- RESA I staff may want to investigate whether out-of-school youth's concerns about the compensation structure and work hours are accurate.
- To support employers as they provide work experiences for youth, RESA I and local staff should consider collaborating to offer training to youth in the areas employers report to be most important. These areas, at this writing, appear to concern social skills, good work habits, and more specific skill sets, such as computer, typing, calculation, or organization abilities.
- As the program develops, RESA I staff ought to develop and implement structures and processes to ease employers' participation.

- RESA I staff and evaluators should explore strategies for increasing response rates to both mail and telephone surveys. Strategies might include beginning data collection at an earlier date in the year, continuing to build and update a comprehensive client database, and collecting alternative contact information for participants.

- Later evaluations of the RESA I program should include data from local service providers to provide staff a more complete account of program activities.

REFERENCES

Beaulieu, L.J. (2000). Rural schools and the Workforce Investment Act. ERIC Digest. Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on April 12, 2002: http://www.ael.org/eric/digests/edorc009.htm

Boshara, R., Scanlon, E., & Page-Adams, D. (2000). An overview of the Workforce Investment Act. *Community action digest, 2:* 1, pp. 21-25.

Brewer, J., & Hunter, A. (1989). *Multi method research: A synthesis of styles.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Buck, M.L. (2002). Charting new territory: Early implementation of the Workforce Investment Act. Philadelphia, PA: Public Private Ventures.

Callahan Consultants. (2001). WIA performance measures for youth: Region I technical assistance workshop. Columbia, MD: Author.

Creative Research Systems. (2001). Online sample size calculator. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on April 12, 2002: http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm

Governor's Workforce Investment Office. (2000). State of West Virginia Executive Order No. 13-00. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on October 2, 2001: http://www.wvgwio.org/press_release_frame.htm

Howley, C. (2002.) *Interim Evaluation of the RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services Program.* Charleston, WV: AEL, Inc.

Imel, S. (1999). One-stop Career Centers. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on April 12, 2002: http://ericir.syr.edu/plweb-cgi/obtain.pl

Johnson, E. (2000). Implementing the Workforce Investment Act. *Community action digest, 2:* 1, pp. 19-20.

Pantazis, C. (1999, August). The new Workforce Investment Act. *Training and development journal, 53:* 8, pp. 48-50.

RESA I. (2001a). In-school program for Region I youth: WIA proposal. Beckley, WV: Author.

RESA I. (2001b). Out-of-school program for Region I youth: WIA proposal. Beckley, WV: Author.

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The program evaluation standards: How to assess evaluations of educational programs*, (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2002). State and county quickfacts. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on May 14, 2002: http://quickfacts.census.gov

U.S. Department of Labor. (1998). Workforce Investment Act of 1998. Retrieved from the World Wide Web, October 1, 2001: http://www.usworkforce.org/Runningtext2.htm

Wallace, J. 2001, October 22. Expert speaks on work programs. *Charleston Daily Mail*, p. 4D.

Wallace, J. 2001, October 31. Agency funding on hold. *Charleston Daily Mail*, pp. 1C, 4C.

Wallace, J. 2001, November 14. Administration hears complaints about work plan. *Charleston Daily Mail*.

West Virginia Governor's Workforce Investment Division. 2002. Workforce West Virginia. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on June 4, 2002: http://www.wvgwio.org/default.html

West Virginia Workforce Investment Board. (2001). Region I Workforce Investment Board Local Plan. Retrieved from the World Wide Web, October 2, 2001: http://wvwib.org/r1/LocalPlan/reg_1_WIB_LocalPlan.htm

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A:

Satisfaction Surveys

RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services Program
Spring 2002 Client Satisfaction Survey
In-School Youth

We are interested in continuously improving out services to you. Your responses to the questions on this survey will give us information to better serve you. Please read each question carefully and then select the rating that best fits your answer. Thank you very much for your help!

1. The following is a list of services you may have received through our program. Please check all of the services that you have received in the last year.
   _____ Tutoring or study skill training
   _____ Alternative high school
   _____ Summer employment opportunities
   _____ Paid or unpaid work experiences
   _____ Job skills training
   _____ Child care or transportation
   _____ Mentoring
   _____ Leadership training
   _____ Follow-up services
   _____ Guidance and counseling

2. Using a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 meaning "very dissatisfied" and 10 meaning "very satisfied," what is your overall level of satisfaction with the services provided by RESA I?

Very Dissatisfied									Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. Considering all of the expectations you may have had about the services, to what extent have the services met those expectations? 1 now means "falls short of your expectations" and 10 means "exceeds expectations."

Falls Short of Expectations									Exceeds Expectations
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. Now think of the ideal program for people in your circumstances. How well do you think the services you received compare with the ideal set of services? 1 now means "not very close to the ideal" and 10 means "very close to the ideal."

Not Very Close to the Ideal									Very Close to the Ideal
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

PLEASE TURN SURVEY OVER TO COMPLETE

For the following questions, please use this scale:

	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4

5.	The services I received helped me meet my education goals.	1	2	3	4
6.	The services I received helped me meet my career goals.	1	2	3	4
7.	I was involved in choosing the services that are right for me.	1	2	3	4
8.	The staff of this program were helpful.	1	2	3	4
9.	The staff of this program were knowledgeable.	1	2	3	4
10.	I felt that the staff respected me.	1	2	3	4
11.	I did not have to wait a long time to receive the services I needed.	1	2	3	4
12.	I received a lot of information through this program.	1	2	3	4
13.	Staff helped me find ways to participate in the program even if there were circumstances that made doing so difficult for me.	1	2	3	4
14.	I had experiences in this program that I would not have had otherwise.	1	2	3	4
15.	Staff were available to answer my questions.				
16.	I feel more prepared for my future because of this program.	1	2	3	4
17.	I am glad I participated in this program.	1	2	3	4

Please complete the following phrases.

18. If I could change two things about the program, I would change . . .

19. At this point in my experience with the program, I could use some help with . . .

20. What school do you go to?

21. Where do you receive Workforce Investment youth services?

Thank you very much for your help!

RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services Program
Spring 2002 Client Satisfaction Phone Survey Protocol
Out-of-School Youth

Interviewee ID number: _____
Date of interview: _____
Time of interview: _____

Hello. My name is _____ with AEL, and I am conducting a survey for the RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services program. I would like to speak to Mr./Ms. _____ , please.

[Continue if participant is answers the phone. If not, wait until participant comes to the phone, then greet with the above, and continue. If the participant is unavailable, ask when might be a good time to reach the participant. Record this information on the survey sheet, and return call at the appropriate time.]

Hello, Mr./Ms. _____ . My name is _____ with AEL, and I am conducting a survey for the RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services program. I would like to ask you some questions about your recent experience with the Youth Services program. Our purpose is to learn from you how to improve programs and services offered to youth in your county. The survey should take about 10 minutes. Is now a good time for you to participate?

[If yes, continue. If no, ask when the participant would be able to participate. Record the answer on the survey sheet, and repeat the call at the appropriate time.]

Thank you very much. First, let me assure you that your answers will be kept anonymous and confidential. That is, nothing you say will ever be associated with your name. Second, I want to let you know that there are no wrong answers. We really are interested in your opinions about this program. Do you have any questions?

First, I am going to read a list of services you may have received. As I read them, indicate those that you remember receiving.

[Interviewer should check each option the respondent selects.]
1.
_____ Tutoring or study skill training
_____ Alternative high school
_____ Summer employment opportunities
_____ Paid or unpaid work experiences
_____ Job skills training
_____ Child care or transportation
_____ Mentoring
_____ Leadership training
_____ Follow-up services
_____ Guidance and counseling

Now I am going to ask you to rate your answers to the following questions. *[Interviewer should circle the rating the respondent chooses.]*

2. Using a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 meaning "very dissatisfied" and 10 meaning "very satisfied," what is your overall level of satisfaction with the services provided by RESA I staff?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't Know Refused

3. Considering all of the expectations you may have had about the services, to what extent have the services met those expectations? 1 now means "falls short of your expectations" and 10 means "exceeds expectations."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't Know Refused

4. Now think of the ideal program for people in your circumstances. How well do you think the services you received compare with the ideal set of services? 1 now means "not very close to the ideal" and 10 means "very close to the ideal."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't Know Refused

For the next set of questions, I am going to read you some statements. Please tell me how much you agree with each statement, using a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 meaning "strongly disagree," 2 meaning "disagree," 3 meaning "agree," and 4 meaning "strongly agree."

		SD	D	A	SA		
5.	The services I received helped me meet my education goals.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
6.	The services I received helped me meet my career goals.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
7.	I was involved in choosing the services that are right for me.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
8.	The staff of this program were helpful.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
9.	The staff of this program were knowledgeable.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
10.	I felt that the staff respected me.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
11.	I did not have to wait a long time to receive the services I needed.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
12.	I received a lot of information through this program.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
13.	Staff helped me find ways to participate in the program even if there were circumstances that made doing so difficult for me.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
14.	I had experiences in this program that I would not have had otherwise.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
15.	Staff were available to answer my questions.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
16.	I feel more prepared for my future because of this program.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
17.	I am glad I participated in this program.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref

Now I am going to ask you to complete several phrases.

18. If I could change two things about the program, I would change . . .

19. At this point in my experience with the program, I could use some help with . . .

Those are all the questions I have today. Thank you very much for talking with me.

RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services Program
Spring 2002 Employer Satisfaction Phone Survey Protocol

Hello. My name is _____ with AEL, and I am conducting a survey for the RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services program. I would like to speak to Mr./Ms. _____ , please.

[Continue if participant is answers the phone. If not, wait until participant comes to the phone, then greet with the above, and continue. If the participant is unavailable, ask when might be a good time to reach the participant. Record this information on the survey sheet, and return call at the appropriate time.]

Hello, Mr./Ms. _____ . My name is _____ with AEL, and I am conducting a survey for the RESA I Workforce Investment Youth Services program. I would like to ask you some questions about your recent experience with the Youth Services program. Our purpose is to learn from you how to improve programs and services offered to employers and youth in your county. The survey should take about 10 minutes. Is now a good time for you to participate?

[If yes, continue. If no, ask when the participant would be able to participate. Record the answer on the survey sheet, and repeat the call at the appropriate time.]

Thank you very much. First, let me assure you that your answers will be kept anonymous and confidential. That is, nothing you say will ever be associated with your name. Second, I want to let you know that there are no wrong answers. We really are interested in your opinions about this program. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. Which of the following did you provide to youth this last year in collaboration with the RESA I Youth Program? (Choose all that apply.)
   - ___ Unpaid work experience (e.g., job shadowing)
   - ___ Paid work experience (e.g., work-based learning)

2. Using a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 meaning "very dissatisfied" and 10 meaning "very satisfied," what is your overall level of satisfaction with the services provided by RESA I staff?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't Know Refused

3. Considering all of the expectations you may have had about the services, to what extent have the services from RESA I staff met those expectations? 1 now means "falls short of your expectations" and 10 means "exceeds expectations."

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't Know Refused

4. Now think of the ideal program for people in your circumstances. How well do you think the services you received compare with the ideal set of services? 1 now means "not very close to the ideal" and 10 means "very close to the ideal."

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't Know Refused

For the next set of questions, I am going to read you some statements. Please tell me how much you agree with each statement, using a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 meaning "strongly disagree," 2 meaning "disagree," 3 meaning "agree," and 4 meaning "strongly agree."

5.	The RESA I Youth Services staff communicated the purpose of the program to me clearly.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
6.	The RESA I Youth Services staff were helpful.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
7.	The RESA I Youth Services staff understood my needs as an employer.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
8.	When I had questions or concerns about the program, RESA I staff responded quickly to them.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
9.	I received adequate support from RESA I throughout the process of offering work experiences to youth.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
10.	The process of providing work experiences to youth has been easy.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
11.	The youth I worked with had the skills I thought they needed for employment in my organization.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
12.	The youth I worked with were well-behaved.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
13.	I think experiences like the one(s) I provided will help youth in my area become better prepared for employment.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
14.	I would recommend this program to other employers.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref
15.	I plan to continue participating in this program.	1	2	3	4	DK	Ref

Now I am going to ask you to complete several sentences.

16. Youth need to come to work experiences like the one(s) I provided with the following job skills:

17. It would be easier for me to participate in this program if . . .

Thank you for answering our questions. We appreciate it very much.

APPENDIX B:

Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

Checklist for Applying the Standards

To interpret the information provided on this form, the reader needs to refer to the full text of the standards as they appear in Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, *The Program Evaluation Standards* (1994), Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

The Standards were consulted and used as indicated in the table below (check as appropriate):

Descriptor		The Standard was addressed	The Standard was partially addressed	The Standard was not addressed	The Standard was not applicable
U1	Stakeholder Identification	X			
U2	Evaluator Credibility	X			
U3	Information Scope and Selection	X			
U4	Values Identification	X			
U5	Report Clarity	X			
U6	Report Timeliness and Dissemination	X			
U7	Evaluation Impact	X			
F1	Practical Procedures	X			
F2	Political Viability				X
F3	Cost Effectiveness	X			
P1	Service Orientation	X			
P2	Formal Agreements	X			
P3	Rights of Human Subjects	X			
P4	Human Interactions	X			
P5	Complete and Fair Assessment	X			
P6	Disclosure of Findings	X			
P7	Conflict of Interest	X			
P8	Fiscal Responsibility	X			
A1	Program Documentation	X			
A2	Context Analysis	X			
A3	Described Purposes and Procedures	X			
A4	Defensible Information Sources	X			
A5	Valid Information	X			
A6	Reliable Information	X			
A7	Systematic Information	X			
A8	Analysis of Quantitative Information	X			
A9	Analysis of Qualitative Information	X			
A10	Justified Conclusions	X			
A11	Impartial Reporting	X			
A12	Metaevaluation			X	

The Program Evaluation Standards (1994, Sage) guided the development of this (check one):

____ request for evaluation plan/design/proposal
____ evaluation plan/design/proposal
____ evaluation contract
__X__ evaluation report
____ other: _____

Name Caitlin Howley Date 6/7/02

Caitlin Howley Caitlin Howley
(signature)

Position or Title R&E Specialist

Agency AEL

Address PO Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325-1348

Relation to Document Author
(e.g., author of document, evaluation team leader, external auditor, internal auditor)

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
X	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").